#### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

#### From the INTERNATIONAL BUREAU

### PCT

NOTIFICATION OF TRANSMITTAL
OF COPIES OF TRANSLATION
OF THE INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT
ON PATENTABILITY
(CHAPIER I OR CHAPTER II
OF THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY)

(PCT Rules 44bis.3(c) and 72.2)

To: STUDIENGESELLSCHAFT KOH Kaiser-Wilhelm-Platz 1 45470 Mülheim an der Ruhr ALLEMAGNE	LE MBH Eingeganger 2 <sup>9</sup> . Jan. 2887
	Erler

Date of mailing (day/month/year)
18 January 2007 (18.01.2007)

Applicant's or agent's file reference
A402

International application No.
PCT/DE2005/000399

Applicant

STUDIENGESELLSCHAFT KOHLE MBH et al

	Transmittal	of the	translation	ŧ.	the applicant.
ι.	ransmua	oi the	translation	ŧo	the applicant.

<b>v</b>	The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the English translation of the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I).

The International Bureau transmits herewith a copy of the English translation of the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II).

### 2. Transmittal of the copy of the translation to the designated or elected Offices.

The International Bureau notifies the applicant that copies of that translation have been transmitted to the following designated or elected Offices requiring such translation:

None

The following designated or elected Offices, having waived the requirement for such a transmittal at this time, will receive copies of that translation from the International Bureau only upon their request:

AE, AG, AL, AM, AP, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BR, BW, BY, BZ, CA, CH, CN, CO, CR, CU, CZ, DK, DM, DZ, EA, EC, EE, EG, EP, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KP, KR, KZ, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LV, MA, MD, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, MZ, NA, NI, NO, NZ, OA, OM, PG, PH, PL, PT, RO, RU, SC, SD, SE, SG, SK, SL, SM, SY, TJ, TM, TN, TR, TT, TZ, UA, UG, US, UZ, VC, VN, YU, ZA, ZM, ZW

3. Reminder regarding translation into (one of) the official language(s) of the elected Office(s).

The applicant is reminded that, where a translation of the international application must be furnished to an elected Office, that translation must contain a translation of any annexes to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter II).

It is the applicant's responsibility to prepare and furnish such translation directly to each elected Office concerned within the applicable time limit (Rule 74.1). See Volume II of the PCT Applicant's Guide for further details.

The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland

Authorized officer

Agnes Wittmann-Regis

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70

Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70

Form PCT/IB/338 (January 2004)

### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

# **PCT**

### INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY REPORT ON PATENTABILITY

(Chapter I of the Patent Cooperation Treaty)

(PCT Rule 44bis)

Applicant's or agent's file reference A402	FOR FURTHER ACTION	See item 4 below	
International application No. PCT/DE2005/000399	International filing date (day/month/year) 09 March 2005 (09.03.2005)	Priority date (day/month/year) 31 March 2004 (31.03.2004)	
International Patent Classification (8th edition unless older edition indicated) See relevant information in Form PCT/ISA/237			
Applicant STUDIENGESELLSCHAFT KOHLE MBH			

1.	This international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) is issued by the International Bureau on behalf of the International Searching Authority under Rule 44 bis.1(a).			
2.	This REPORT consists of a total	of 14 sheets, including this cover sheet.		
	In the attached sheets, any reference to the written opinion of the International Searching Authority should be read as a reference to the international preliminary report on patentability (Chapter I) instead.			
3.	This report contains indications relating to the following items:			
	Box No. I	Basis of the report		
	Box No. II	Priority		
	Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability			
	Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention			
	Box No. V  Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement			
	Box No. VI Certain documents cited			
	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application		
	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application		
4.	The International Bureau will communicate this report to designated Offices in accordance with Rules 44bis.3(c) and 93bis.1 but not, except where the applicant makes an express request under Article 23(2), before the expiration of 30 months from the priority date (Rule 44bis.2).			

	Date of issuance of this report 09 January 2007 (09.01.2007)
The International Bureau of WIPO 34, chemin des Colombettes 1211 Geneva 20, Switzerland	Authorized officer Agnes Wittmann-Regis
Facsimile No. +41 22 338 82 70	e-mail: pt06@wipo.int

#### PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION From the INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY WRITTEN OPINION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY (PCT Rule 43bis.1) Date of mailing See form PCT/ISA/210 (day/month/year) Applicant's or agent's file reference FOR FURTHER ACTION A402 See paragraph 2 below International application No. International filing date (day/month/year) Priority date (day/month/year) PCT/DE2005/000399 09.03.2005 31.03.2004 International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC C25B11/04, C23C18/12, C01G55/00 Applicant STUDIENGESELLSCHAFT KOHLE MBH This opinion contains indications relating to the following items: Box No. I Basis of the opinion Box No. II Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis. I(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial Box No. V applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement Box No. VI Certain documents cited Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application FURTHER ACTION If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered. If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later. For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220. Name and mailing address of the ISA/EP Authorized officer Facsimile No. Telephone No.

Вох	No. I	Basis of this opinion
I.		regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was unless otherwise indicated under this item.
		This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language , which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under
2.	With inven	Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).  regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed tion, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
	a.	type of material  a sequence listing  table(s) related to the sequence listing
	b.	format of material  in written format  in computer readable form
	c.	time of filing/furnishing
		contained in the international application as filed.  filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
		furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3.		In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filled or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filled or does not go beyond the application as filled, as appropriate, were furnished.
4.	Addit	ional connents:

Box	Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement			
1.	Statement			
	Novelty (N)	Claims 2-5	YES	
		Claims 1, 6-9	NO	
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims	YES	
		Claims 1-9	NO	
	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims 1-9	YES	
		Claims	NO	
_				
2.	Citations and explanations:			
	1.1 Reference	e is made to the following documents:		
:				
	D1: DATA	ABASE WPI Section Ch, Week 198750 Derwent		
	Pub.	lications Ltd., London, GB; Class D15, AN		
	1987	7-351947 XP002362777 & JP 62 254817 A		
	(FUJI ELECTRIC MFG CO LTD) 6 November 1987			
	(1987-11-06)			
	• •			
	, D2: DE	102 11 701 A1 (STUDIENGESELLSCHAFT KOHLE		
	MBH) 25 September 2003 (2003-09-25)			
	∫D3: US-X	A-3 711 385 (BEER H, BE) 16 January 1973		
	,~	73-01-16)		
	,			
	D4: US-A	A-5 658 355 (COTTEVIEILLE ET AL) 19 August		
	V	7 (1997-08-19)		
	100	(133) 00 13)		
	*D5. IIC_	A-5 550 706 (KURZWEIL ET AL) 27 August		
	~f			
	199	6 (1996–08–27)		
	P. C	00/00001 B (WIE INTRED OFF THE OF THE CT.)		
	₩.	98/02891 A (THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)		
	22	January 1998 (1998-01-22)		

#### 1 NOVELTY

- 1.1 The present application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) because the subject matter of claims 1, and 6-9 is not novel within the meaning of PCT Article 33(2)).
- 1.2 Document D1 discloses (the references between parentheses apply to said document) a method for producing a Ti electrode, comprising the following steps: a) applying colloidal iridium oxide to a Ti surface, b) drying the coated surface and c) burning the surface (cf. Derwent, abstract).

The subject matter of claims 1, 6 and 7 therefore lacks novelty.

1.3 Document D2 (the references between parentheses apply to said document) discloses a method for in situ immobilisation of water-soluble nanodispersed preformed metal oxide colloids on an oxidic or non-oxidic substrate (e.g. TiO2, SnO2). The particle size of the nanostructured metal oxide colloids lies between 0.5 nm and 5 nm, preferably between 1 and 3 nm. Colloidal metal oxide is produced by hydrolysis, stirring an aqueous solution of the metal salt (e.g. Ir salt) and a base (e.g. KOH). The temperature used for the reaction is between 50 and 90°C. The colloidal particles are immobilised on the substrate from the reaction solution (cf. page 2, paragraphs 1-2,

lines 1-15, page 3, paragraph 17, page 4, paragraphs 21, 23-29, page 7, example 6, table 3, lines 10-15).

The subject matter of claims 8 and 9 therefore lacks novelty.

#### 3 INVENTIVE STEP

3.1 The present application does not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(1) because the subject matter of claims 1-9 does not involve an inventive step within the meaning of PCT Article 33(3).

#### DEPENDENT CLAIMS 2-7

- Dependent claims 2-6 do not contain any features that, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, meet the PCT requirements for inventive step. With regard to the features of claims 2-6, document D2 describes the same advantages as the present application. The person skilled in the art would therefore consider the inclusion of these features in the method described in D1 to be a routine measure for solving the problem of interest (see items 1.2 and 1.3 in the present report).
- 3.3 The subject matter of claims 6 and 7 is not novel and therefore does not involve an inventive step either (PCT Article 33(3)).

International application No.
PCT/DE2005/000399

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

#### INDEPENDENT CLAIM 1

- Document D3 is considered the closest prior art 3.4 over the subject matter of claim 1. It discloses (references in brackets relate to said document): A method for producing coatings consisting of 95% platinum oxide and 5% silicon oxide, said method comprising the following steps: a) applying colloidal platinum oxide to a Ti surface (e.g. by immersion), b) drying the coated surface and c) burning the surface at a temperature of 800-1100°C (cf. example 12, lines 20-41). D3 also discloses a method for producing coatings consisting of 50% iridium oxide and 50% rhodium oxide, said method comprising the following steps: a) applying colloidal 50% IrO2 and 50% RhO2 to an Nb surface (e.g. by immersion), b) drying the coated surface and c) reaction pressing (cf. example 11, lines 60-70).
- 3.5 The subject matter of claim 1 in the present application therefore differs from the known features in document D3 in that the coating is of platinum oxide instead of iridium oxide (cf. D3, example 12).
- 3.6 However, it is generally known to the person skilled in the art that the "iridium oxide" feature is equivalent to the "platinum oxide" feature known from document D3 and can be replaced by the latter if required, because iridium (or

"platinum metal" as it is called) is a metal in the platinum group.

3.7 Furthermore, since no references can be found in the application specifying the problem that is solved by the "iridium oxide" feature of the present application, compared to the prior art disclosed in D3, the subject matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step.

Therefore, the subject matter of claim 1 does not involve an inventive step over document D3 (PCT Article 33(3)).

#### INDEPENDENT CLAIM 8

3.8 The subject matter of claim 8 is not novel and for that reason does not involve an inventive step (PCT Article 33(3)).

#### INDEPENDENT CLAIM 9

3.9 Document D3 is also considered the closest prior art to the subject matter of claim 9. It discloses (the references between parentheses apply to said document) a method for producing a colloidal metal oxide mixture consisting of 50% IrO<sub>2</sub> and 50% RhO<sub>2</sub>, by reaction of the aqueous solution of the salt of the metals (the Ir salt and the Rh salt) and the caustic soda solution (NaOH solution) (cf. example 11, lines 50-60).

of 100% IrO<sub>2</sub>.

Box No. V

International application No.
PCT/DE2005/000399

3.10 The subject matter of claim 91 in the present application therefore differs from the known features in document D3 in that a metal oxide mixture (50% IrO<sub>2</sub> and 50% RhO<sub>2</sub>) is produced instead

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;

- 3.11 However, it is generally known to the person skilled in the art that the "iridium oxide" feature and the "rhodium oxide" feature are equivalent and interchangeable, because iridium and rhodium (or "platinum metals" as they are collectively called) are metals in the platinum group.
- . 3.12 Furthermore, since no references can be found in the application specifying the problem that is solved by the "iridium oxide" feature of the present application, compared to the prior art disclosed in D3, the subject matter of claim 9 does not involve an inventive step.
  - 3.13 Document D4 (the references between parentheses apply to said document) discloses a method for producing ruthenium oxide or metal oxide mixtures of ruthenium oxide and iridium oxide by reaction of the aqueous solution of the salt of the metals (H<sub>2</sub>IrCl<sub>6</sub> and RuCl<sub>3</sub> xH<sub>2</sub>O) and a concentrated alkaline solution (cf. example 2). D4 also discloses a method for producing coatings consisting of metal oxide mixtures of ruthenium oxide and iridium oxide, said method comprising the following steps:

    a) applying colloidal metal oxides to a Ti

surface, b) drying the coated surface and c) burning the surface in the hardening oven (cf. example 4). Furthermore, D4 discloses pretreatment of the titanium substrate (cf. example 5) and the feature specifying that the surface to be coated is the surface of a titanium electrode (cf. example 4).

It also follows, for the same reasons (see items 3.4, 3.5, 3.8 and 3.9 above), that the subject matter of claims 1-9 does not involve an inventive step over document D4.

- 3.14 Document D5 (the references between parentheses apply to said document) also discloses a method for producing colloidal ruthenium oxide by reaction between the aqueous solution of the Ru salt (RuCl $_3$  xH $_2$ O) and the caustic soda solution (1N NaOH solution) (cf. example 2).
- 3.15 Document D6 also describes a method for producing colloidal metal oxides (e.g. iridium oxide, ruthenium oxide) by reaction, under stirring, between the aqueous solution of the metal salt (RuCl<sub>3</sub> nH<sub>2</sub>O) and the caustic soda solution (NaOH solution) (cf. page 5, line 31 page 6, line 13; page 6, line 19 page 7, line 9; page 8, line 7 page 9, line 3; claims 2-5).

Accordingly, the subject matter of claim 9 likewise does not involve an inventive step over document D5 or document D6.

Sox No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
	·
4	INDUSTRIAL APPLICABILITY
4.1	Claims $1-9$ comply with the requirements of PCT
	Article 33(4), because the invention can be used
	to treat metal surfaces.
	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •

Box	No. VI Certain documents cited			
1.	Certain published documents (Rule 43bis.1 and	70.10)		
	Application No. Patent No.	Publication date (day/month/year)	Filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (valid claim) (day/month/year)
	I district	(tay monto year)	(day/montal vetti)	(aay mount year)
į				
<u> </u>	N			······································
2.	Non-written disclosures (Rule 43bis.1 and 70.9)	•	Dat	e of written disclosure
	Kind of non-written disclosure	Date of non-written dis (day/month/year	closure referrin	g to non-written disclosure (day/month/year)
				(day months year)
Se	ee Form 210			

International application No. PCT/DE2005/000399

Box No. VIII

Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the claims of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

- 1 The application does not satisfy the requirements of PCT Article 6, because claims 1 and 3-9 are not clear.
- The expressions "particularly", "preferably" and "particularly preferred" used in claims 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 are vague and unclear and do not restrict the scope of protection of the claim, that is to say, any feature preceded by such an expression must be considered entirely optional (PCT Article 6, PCT Guidelines Chapter 5, paragraph 5.40).
- The reference "pH > 11, preferably ≥12" described on page 3, line 26 or on page 4, lines 14-15 does not fall under the current claims 4 and 9. This contradiction between claims 4, 9 and the description gives rise to doubts concerning the subject matter for which protection is sought, with the result that claims 4 and 9 are not clear (PCT Article 6).
- The signs "d", "e" and "f" used in claim 1 appear to be incorrect (or typing mistakes), and leave the reader uncertain as to the meaning of the technical feature in question. As a result, the

Certain observations on the international application

Box No. VIII

International application No.
PCT/DE2005/000399

subject matter of said claim is not clearly defined (PCT Article 6).

- Claim 1 does not satisfy the requirements of PCT
  Article 6, because the subject matter for which
  protection is sought is not clearly defined. Claim
  1 attempts to define the subject matter in terms
  of the result to be achieved, namely that "steps a
  to c can be repeated until the desired layer
  thickness has been obtained", but in doing so
  merely states the problem to be solved, without
  proposing the technical features necessary for
  achieving said result.
- Furthermore, the expression "desired layer thickness" used in claim 1 is vague and unclear and does not restrict the scope of protection of the claim, that is to say, any feature preceded by such an expression must be considered entirely optional (PCT Article 6, PCT Guidelines Chapter 5, paragraph 5.40).